DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 038 879 FL 000 223

AUTHOR Moulton, William G.
TITLE Linguistics and Language Teaching in the United States, 1940-1960.
PUB DATE [63]
NOTE 30p.; Offprint from Trends in European and American Linguistics

EDRS PRICE EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$1.60
DESCRIPTORS *Annotated Bibliographies, *Applied Linguistics, College Language Programs, *Educational History, Educational Strategies, Educational Trends, English (Second Language), Federal Programs, Instructional Improvement, *Language Instruction, Language Programs, *Modern Languages, Program Descriptions, Teaching Methods, Teaching Procedures

ABSTRACT

The history of the involvement of linguistics in the teaching of languages is presented in terms of a description of contributing events, a pinpointing of important programs, and a running bibliography. Some remarks on the status of foreign language study in the 20's and 30's preface a discussion of the far-reaching effects of the U.S. Army's adoption of the American Council of Learned Societies' Intensive Language Program. The pamphlet concludes with observations on the teaching of English as a second language. (AF)

ED038879

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE UNITED STATES

1940-1960

WILLIAM G. MOULTON

FL 000 223

OFFPRINT
TRENDS IN EUROPEAN AND AMERICAN LINGUISTICS

Reprinted with permission of the author and of the publishers,
Spectrum Publishers, Utrecht, Netherlands.

For sale by the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office
Washington 25, D.C. - Price 15 cents

LINGUISTICS AND LANGUAGE TEACHING IN THE UNITED STATES
1940-1960

WILLIAM G. MOULTON

The interest of American linguists in language teaching extends over a period of many years. One of the earliest and certainly one of the greatest of American linguists, William Dwight Whitney, was the author not only of a scholarly grammar of Sanskrit but also of school grammars of English, French, and German. A great American linguist of a later period, Leonard Bloomfield, began his career as a teacher of German and also wrote an elementary German textbook. And in his book *Language* (New York, 1933), which served as a guide to a whole generation of American linguists, Bloomfield not only presented his theory of linguistics but also, in a final chapter on 'Applications and Outlook,' discussed the ways in which the findings of linguistics could be applied to the teaching of foreign languages. Despite this long interest in language teaching, however, it was not until 1941 that any considerable body of linguists assumed the role of active language teachers and attempted whole-heartedly to apply the findings of their science to the practical problems of language teaching. In order to understand how and why this attempt was made, we need first to consider the status of foreign language teaching in the United States during the immediately preceding decades.

Three factors characterize the status of foreign language study during the 1920's and 1930's. First of all, there was very little foreign language learning going on at the time. In the high schools, relatively few pupils studied a foreign language; and of those who did, relatively few kept it up for more than two years. Pupils who were learning French, for example, often dropped it after two years of study because, as was the common phrase, 'I've already had French.' Those who wished to go on to college were generally required to offer no more than this smattering of a foreign language; and where the college entrance requirement was higher, it seldom went beyond three years of one language or two years of each of two. In the colleges themselves

the study of one foreign language (rarely two) was widely required for graduation; but here again the requirement was seldom more than could be learned in two years of college study. There were, of course, small numbers of students who through a combination of high school and college study gained a genuinely useful knowledge of one or more foreign languages, but nowhere in the educational system was such a knowledge made a requirement for anyone.

A second characteristic of foreign language study during this period was the fact that it was limited to very few languages. In the high schools the only languages widely offered were Latin, Spanish, and French; to these the colleges added German, Greek, and to a lesser extent Italian; but these six languages were the only ones commonly studied or even offered. There were many other languages offered at one place or another in the United States, but instruction in them was limited to very few institutions and they were studied only by very small numbers of students.

The third feature characteristic of foreign language study was the type of instruction given. Though many individual teachers placed varying degrees of emphasis on speaking and understanding, certainly the most common type of instruction was by the 'grammar and translation' method, used in much the same form for both ancient and modern foreign languages. One of its aims was to teach the 'grammar' of the language, by which was meant its inflectional paradigms (taught in terms of spelling rather than of speech) and certain rules for combining words into phrases and sentences. The teacher spent a large part of his time explaining the grammar; the students learned it by memorizing the paradigms and the rules; and they applied the grammar by translating English sentences into the foreign language. The second aim was to teach the student to read the foreign language. The teaching method employed was that of more or less word-for-word translation from the foreign language into English, accompanied sometimes by the memorizing of lists of words.

A full explanation of how this status of language study came about would go far beyond the bounds of this report, but at least a few reasons need to be mentioned. Heavy emphasis on explication of grammar and memorization of grammatical rules was a traditional approach to language learning, and was matched in many other parts of the world. The choice of reading ability as a primary objective was at least in part based on the so-called 'Coleman Report': Algernon Coleman, *The teaching of modern foreign languages in the United States* (New York, 1929; – Publications of the American and Canadian

Committees on Modern Languages, vol. 12). The argument given here was that, since the typical high school pupil studied a foreign language for only two years, he could not possibly attain more than one objective; therefore only one objective should be aimed at, and the most widely useful one was a reading knowledge. As for the small number of languages studied, and the few pupils studying them, both of these factors were symptomatic of the United States during the period between the two wars. Though the nation had, in fact, already become a world power, the average American was quite unaware of this change, and he felt no particular need to enter into closer contact with foreign cultures and countries whether through language study or otherwise. To be sure, a few languages were considered to hold some value: the learning of Latin was thought to sharpen one's logical powers and improve one's knowledge of English grammar; French was considered an adjunct of culture; Spanish was good for trade relations; and German was useful for the study of the sciences. A knowledge of other foreign languages, however, was little more than evidence that a recent immigrant had failed to become properly Americanized.

The outbreak of World War II in 1939 and, more particularly, the Japanese attack on Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941, brought an abrupt end to this linguistic isolationism. Within the armed forces it was realized that vast numbers of young Americans would soon be scattered throughout a large proportion of the globe, and that they would have need of many languages whose very names were unknown to most Americans. Furthermore, though the armed forces appreciated a reading knowledge of any of these languages, they were far more interested in a practical speaking knowledge, and not interested in grammar as such at all. Since the schools and colleges of the nation had produced few persons with a practical control of the familiar languages (a situation deplored by none more than the language teachers of the country), the armed forces realized that they must establish language training facilities of their own.

The armed forces were not the first to anticipate the coming need for speakers of a wide variety of unfamiliar languages. Largely through the foresight of its Executive Secretary, Mortimer Graves, the American Council of Learned Societies (ACLS) had in early 1941 established an Intensive Language Program. Graves believed that the first essential task was a sound linguistic analysis of each language to be taught, followed by the preparation of learning materials based on this analysis; and he was confident that the linguists of the country,

though few in number, were the persons best qualified for this work. With the aid of funds provided by the Rockefeller Foundation, a small number of linguists was put to work on descriptive analyses of a number of languages for which no adequate teaching materials existed, and preparations were made for a number of intensive language courses. In April of 1942 the Secretary-Treasurer of the Linguistic Society, J Milton Cowan, came to Washington to assume the position of Director of the Intensive Language Program. By the following summer there were in operation no less than 56 courses, in 26 languages, at 18 universities, involving a total of some 700 students.

When the armed forces began to look for the type of language training which they believed they needed, they found it in the work of the Intensive Language Program. As a result, the Washington office of the Program soon became the planning center for a massive attack on the teaching of a wide variety of familiar and unfamiliar languages. It is safe to say that, before the Program was over, just about every trained linguist in the country, young or old, had become involved in it in one way or another. In 1942 Leonard Bloomfield published his *Outline guide for the practical study of foreign languages*, intended for the person who must learn a language for which no formal instructional materials are available; in the same year Bernard Bloch and George L. Trager published their *Outline of linguistic analysis*, to provide the necessary theoretical background for such a learner; and in the following year Robert A. Hall, Jr., published his *Melanesian Pidgin phrase-book and vocabulary* and *Melanesian Pidgin English*: *grammar*, *texts*, *vocabulary* (all four volumes Baltimore: Linguistic Society of America). In April of 1943 the first area and language courses of the Army Specialized Training Program (ASTP) were established, and by the end of the year some 15,000 soldiers were being trained at 55 colleges and universities in 27 different languages. The same year also saw the establishment of the Army's Civil Affairs Training Schools (CATS), which gave language and other training to officers intended for occupational duties in Italy, Germany, and Japan. During this whole period, under the direction of the linguist (then Major) Henry Lee Smith, Jr., the Education Branch of the Army's Special Services Division was engaged in the production of a wide variety of language materials, ranging from simple phrase books to dictionaries and complete language courses. Outstanding among these were the manuals in the co-called 'Spoken Language' series, entitled *Spoken Burmese*, *Spoken Chinese*, etc. The names of their authors and co-authors form a partial roster of the younger linguists of the period: Bernard Bloch

(Japanese), William S. Cornyn (Burmese), Isidore Dyen (Malay), Mary R. Haas (Thai), Robert A. Hall, Jr. (French), Einar Haugen (Norwegian), Charles F. Hockett (Chinese), Carelton T. Hodge (Serbo-Croatian), Henry M. Hoenigswald (Hindustani), Henry and Renée Kahane (Greek), Fred Lukoff (Korean), Norman A. McQuown (Turkish), William G. Moulton (German), Thomas A. Sebeok (Finnish, Hungarian), S. N. Treviño (Spanish), Ralph L. Ward (Greek), and – among the older generation – Leonard Bloomfield (Dutch, Russian).

In these manuals written by linguists, in the ASTP and CATS programs, and in the Bloomfield *Outline guide*, there emerged an outlook on language teaching which, even if we discount the special demands of the moment, was vastly different from that prevalent in the schools and colleges of the country. Of interest to us here are the linguistic principles on which these differences were based, and the conclusions which the linguists drew from them. We shall quote these principles in the forms which came to be the slogans of the day.

'Language is speech, not writing.' To the average American this statement came as something of a shock. All the 'language learning' he could remember was connected with learning to read and write during his first school years, and hence 'language learning' and learning to read and write were, to him, two inseparable aspects of the same thing. Yet to the linguists, particularly to those who had worked on the languages of preliterate American Indian cultures, the truth of this statement was utterly obvious. The conclusion which they drew from it was that the student should first be taught to speak the foreign language; teaching him to read it was a totally different and quite separate problem, and it should be taken up at some later stage in the language learning process – if, indeed, there was time for it at all. Recognition of the fact that speech is primary, writing secondary, also influenced the linguists in two other ways. First, they obviously based their linguistic analyses on the language as it is spoken, and not as it is written. Thus in French, for example, the feminine *grande* was no longer derived from the masculine *grand* by the addition of *-e*; rather, masculine /grã/ was derived from feminine /grãd/ by the subtraction of the final consonant. Similarly, Japanese *hanasu* was no longer analyzed as stem *hana-* plus ending *-su*, but as stem *hanas-* plus ending *-u* (an obvious analysis, but one not used by the Japanese because it cannot be written in the Japanese syllabary). Secondly, since some kind of spelling is desirable in teaching learners who are literate, the linguists felt free to make up one of their own – which was, of course, a (more or less) phonemic transcription. Such a phone-

mic transcription was obviously more consistent than any conventional orthography, and it therefore gave the student a better guide to the language itself, that is to say, to speech. It was not something which the student was supposed to learn to write, however; it was intended to serve merely as an 'aid to listening.'

'A language is a set of habits.' As anthropologists (in part, at least), the linguists were in agreement in looking upon language as a social phenomenon, as one more example of learned and shared behavior – unique only to the extent that it is the most highly structured type of learned and shared behavior. They were also in agreement that the ordinary speaker is quite unaware of the mechanisms of speech: the structure of the phonology, of the morphology, and of the syntax of his native language. Such things are produced 'out of awareness': the ordinary speaker is aware only of *what* he says, not of how he says it. The conclusion which the linguists drew from this was that the learner, too, must be taught to handle the mechanisms of the new language 'out of awareness.' Such features as pronunciation, endings, agreement, word order and the like must become matters of habit for the learner, just as for the native. Indeed, until they *had* become matters of habit, the student could not truly be said to have 'learned' the language. Further, if the mechanisms of a language constitute a set of habits, then learning a new language consists of learning these habits; and the learning of habits is best accomplished, the linguists reasoned, by constant imitation, repetition, practice, and drill. From this they took their cue as to how classroom instruction should be conducted: students should spend most of their time either imitating a native speaker or talking with him and with each other – all the time practicing the material of the particular lesson until it had become a matter of habit. Work outside of class should be of a similar nature: memorizing new material and learning through practice how to vary it. Since the student was to mimic the native speaker in class, and to memorize the materials outside of class, the whole process soon came to be known as one of 'mimicry-memorization' – or, for short, 'mim-mem.'

'Teach the language, not about the language.' It will be recalled that one of the primary goals of traditional language instruction had been the teaching of grammar. The student was required not only to learn the language itself, but also to learn to make statements *about* the language. To the linguists this latter type of activity was wasteful in so far as it took up valuable time which ought properly to be used in learning the language itself. This was not because the linguists were

uninterested in grammar; on the contrary, they were fascinated by it, and many of the 'Spoken Language' manuals contained not only new and original formulations of grammar, along structural lines, but also a good deal more grammar than many traditional textbooks. For the linguists as language teachers, however, grammar was not an end in itself but merely a means to an end. Instruction in grammar, like instruction in phonology, was extremely useful in helping the beginner to imitate the forms of the new language correctly, and to practice and vary them until they had become matters of habit. But once they *had* become matters of habit, grammar was no longer necessary. The real goal of instruction was an ability to *talk* the language, and not to talk *about* it.

"A language is what its native speakers say, not what someone thinks they ought to say." In traditional language teaching the primary source of information about a language was to be found in books: books on pronunciation, on grammar, on style, and the like. This could obviously not be the attitude of the linguists, many of whom had analyzed American Indian languages for which no written materials existed – until the linguists wrote them. For the linguists, the ultimate – and in many cases the only – source of information about a language was the native speakers of that language. The way they talked *was* the language. And so the linguists carried over into language teaching the concept, familiar from anthropological field work, of the 'informant' – the native who serves as a source of information about all aspects of his culture, including language. Since the linguists analyzed the speech which they heard from their informants, their results did not always agree with those found in the traditional prescriptive grammars. Many languages – English is an excellent example – contain usages common to all speakers but condemned by the prescriptive grammars as 'incorrect'. In addition, there are probably always considerable differences between formal and informal speech; and where traditional grammars rarely described anything but the formal variety, the linguists obviously described the informal variety which they heard from their informants. Finally, every language with a considerable number of speakers shows different social and regional varieties. Where the writers of traditional grammars chose for their description a social and regional variety (or perhaps an imagined ideal variety) which seemed to them most worthy of imitation, the linguists tried to select an informant who spoke a social and regional variety that was widely acceptable and then simply analyzed what they heard. Students were specifically warned, however, that other

varieties might be equally acceptable. The general instruction given was to 'copy what the native speaker says,' whether or not it agreed with what was in the textbook, because 'the native speaker is always right.'

'Languages are different.' The traditional grammars of the familiar European languages are derived to an extraordinary extent from the grammars of Latin and Greek. In many American schools it is still customary to 'conjugate' English verbs in three persons each for both singular and plural, as in Latin, despite the fact that (except for the verb *be*) the present consists of only two forms and the past of only one: 'I see, you see, he *sees*, we see, you see, they see; I saw, you saw, he saw, we saw, you saw, they saw.' Such paradigms are useful exercises in the pronunciation of the pronouns, but they hardly qualify as 'conjugations.' Many of the grammatical categories of Latin and Greek can be applied without too much distortion to the familiar languages of Europe, since these are also of Indo-European origin. When they are applied to languages not of Indo-European origin, however, the distortion often becomes so obvious as to be ludicrous. The linguists were therefore committed to the principle that each language should be analyzed in terms of its own grammatical structure, and not in terms of Latin or Greek or of any fancied 'universal' grammar based on European semantic categories. The linguists applied this principle not only to the unfamiliar languages but also to their new analyses of the familiar European languages – and again their analyses differed from those of the traditional grammars.

The realization that 'languages are different' also influenced strongly the linguists' ideas on the role which translation should play in language instruction. Relatively little emphasis was placed on translation from the foreign language into English, since it was realized that the full meaning of a word in one language can rarely be matched by a word in another language, and that therefore no translation is ever fully satisfactory. The ability to translate elegantly is a proper goal for very advanced students, but it obviously lies far beyond the powers of beginners. The linguists made a particular point of avoiding translation from English into the foreign language. Instead of presenting the student with English sentences and asking him to give the foreign equivalent, they used English only to suggest a familiar situation and then asked the student to act out the situation in the foreign language. This was in sharp contrast to traditional textbooks, where an essential part of each lesson is always a section entitled, 'Translate into French (or Spanish, etc.).' To the linguists, exercises of

this sort seemed to be little more than puzzle-solving activities: the pieces of the puzzle were the words in the vocabulary; the rules of the puzzle were those of grammar; to solve the puzzle the student had to put the pieces together according to the rules. Not only did such a puzzle fail to amuse; it was also directly harmful. Since few students could solve the puzzle correctly, most of them received practice not in writing correct French but rather in writing *in*correct French (or Spanish, etc.).

In evaluating the linguists' attitudes toward language instruction in these wartime courses, it is necessary to keep in mind the fact that they were planned for a specific purpose. The linguists were asked to design a program which would produce a practical speaking knowledge in as short a time as possible; and this is precisely what they attempted to do. Many traditional language teachers at the time were troubled by various aspects of the method – and with good reason, because the traditional language teachers quite properly thought in terms of a different kind of education. In the wartime courses, the linguists looked upon grammar only as a means to an end, as something to be learned thoroughly until it could be manipulated 'out of awareness.' This is certainly a proper goal for any type of language instruction. As part of a liberal education, however, we may also want the student to retain an understanding of the structure of the foreign language, just as we want him to gain and retain an understanding of the structure of his native English. With this the linguist can agree; but he will insist that this is no longer language teaching but linguistics, and that the student should also be given an understanding of the phonology of the foreign language (and of his native English), i.e. be taught a little phonetics and phonemics. Likewise, as part of a liberal education we must be interested not only in teaching our students to speak, but also in teaching them to say something worth listening to; and this means that part of their work must consist in reading some of the great things which have been said in the particular language, some of its best works of literature. With this the linguist can again agree; but he will insist that these two goals should not be confused, and that the language must not be neglected in favor of the literature, as was so often the case in traditional language courses.

The literature, pro and con, on wartime language instruction is enormous, and only a few items can be included here. For a review similar to that of this paper, cf. Mary R. Haas, "The application of linguistics to language teaching," in A. L. Kroeber, ed., *Anthropology today* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1953), 807–818. On the Intensive Language Program,

cf. Mortimer Graves and J M. Cowan, *Report of the first year's operation of the Intensive Language Program of the American Council of Learned Societies, 1941–1942* ([Washingon: ACLS], December 20, 1942, pp. 40; excerpted in *Hispania*, XXV [Dec. 1942], 485–493). On the linguist and his informant as a language teaching team, cf. Mary R. Haas, "The linguist as a teacher of languages," *Language*, XIX (1943), 203–208. For a description and evaluation of ASTP and CATS teaching methods, and recommendations for adaptation to civilian instruction, cf. *A survey of language classes in the Army Specialized Training Program* (New York: Commission on Trends in Education [of the Modern Language Association], 1944, pp. 27, second printing pp. 34). Cf. also Charles S. Hyneman, "The Army's Civil Affairs Training Program," *American Political Science Review*, XXXVIII (1944), 342–353, and "The wartime area and language courses," *Bulletin*, American Assocation of University Professors, XXXI (1945), 434–447. The wartime methods and materials, and programs and materials which later developed out of them, are described in Jacob Ornstein, "Structurally oriented texts and teaching methods since World War II: A survey and appraisal," *Modern Language Journal*, XL (1946), 213–222.

Detailed discussions and extensive bibliography are included in: Paul F. Angiolillo, *Armed forces' foreign language teaching: Critical evaluation and implications* (New York: S. F. Vanni, 1947, pp. vi, 440); Robert John Matthew, *Language and area studies in the armed services: Their future significance* (Washington: American Council on Education, 1947, pp. xix, 211); Melva Lind, "Modern language learning: The intensive course as sponsored by the United States Army and implications for the undergraduate course of study," *Genetic Psychology Monographs*, XXXVIII (Aug. 1948), 3–81. Cf. also "The A.S.T.P. and after," chapter 11 in Maxim Newmark, *Twentieth century modern language teaching: Sources and readings* (New York: Philosophical Library, 1948); and "Language teaching during World War II," in John B. Carroll, *The study of language: A survey of linguistics and related disciplines in America* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1953), pp. 173–177. The Army directive outlining the objectives of the ASTP language instruction, and the methodology suggested (though not prescribed), is reprinted in the MLA *Survey of language classes*, pp. 4–5, and in Lind, "Modern language learning," pp. 19–20; a somewhat later version, dated June 23, 1943, is reprinted in Matthew, *Area and language studies*, pp. 62–63, and in the *German Quarterly*, XVII (Nov. 1944), 225–226.

The success of the ASTP led to a number of articles in the public press containing exaggerated, even fantastic claims for the new 'Army method' of language teaching. Of the various replies written to set the record straight, the following may be mentioned: Henry Grattan Doyle, "'Learning languages in a hurry' – but not by miracles," *School and Society*, LVIII (Dec. 18, 1943), 465–467; J Milton Cowan and Mortimer Graves, "A statement on intensive language instruction," *Hispania*, XXVII (Feb. 1944), 65–66, reprinted in the *German Quarterly*, XVII (Nov. 1944),

165–166; "Foreign languages and the Army program," *PMLA*, LIX (Suppl. 1944), 1317. Cf. also Einar Haugen, "Linguists and the wartime program of language teaching," *Modern Language Journal*, XXXIX (1955), 243–245.

As we have seen, the philosophy of language teaching which lay behind the ASTP and CATS courses and the 'Spoken Language' manuals came ultimately from the Intensive Language Program of the ACLS; and the persons primarily involved were all members of the Linguistic Society of America, a constituent society of the ACLS. There thus arose a sometimes confusing but always fruitful cooperation among these several organizations and programs. The original military editions of the manuals nicely illustrate the point: they were published for the United States Armed Forces Institute by the Linguistic Society of America and the Intensive Language Program of the ACLS, with copyright held by the Linguistic Society.

When the war was ended, these various interests were continued by an organ of the ACLS known as the Committee on the Language Program (CLP). Since the Linguistic Society chose to limit its activities to the holding of semi-annual meetings and the publication of scholarly research (a policy not changed until December, 1959), the CLP during the following years became the one nationwide organization which actively sought to further the cause of linguistics. It encouraged and sponsored research in linguistics, and sought to provide for its publication; through fellowships to the summer Linguistic Institutes it furthered training in linguistics; and – of particular interest to us here – it promoted the application of linguistics to various fields of activity, including language teaching. The manuals of the 'Spoken Language' series were republished through Henry Holt & Co., New York, and thus made available to the civilian market; through subsequent additions the list came to embrace 22 different languages: Iraqi Arabic, Burmese, Mandarin Chinese, Danish, Dutch, Finnish, French, German, Greek, Hindustani, Hungarian, Italian, Japanese, Korean, Malay, Norwegian, Portuguese, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Spanish, Thai, and Turkish. (It is worth mentioning that all the living authors of these manuals assigned their royalties to the ACLS so that they might be used for the support of linguistic research.) Also republished through Holt was the *Dictionary of everyday usage*, a German-English, English-German conversational dictionary edited by J. Alan Pfeffer. (On the aims and activities of the CLP, see "Language study and American education," *Language*, XXIX [1953], 215–218, reprinted in *PMLA*, LXVIII [Sept. suppl. 1953], 56–61. The enlarging activities

of the CLP were reflected in the subsequent change of its name to "Committee on Language Programs.")

In 1952, with the aid of a grant from the Ford Foundation, the CLP inaugurated a Program in Oriental Languages, intended "to develop linguistic competence in oriental languages and to prepare and publish language tools in as many languages as possible. The term oriental was interpreted in the broadest sense... The Committee consider ideal implementation in any language to be the availability of the following: a) a descriptive analysis of the language on modern linguistic principles; b) where relevant, an introduction to the writing system; c) an elementary text and exercise books in the spoken language; d) a graded reader or readers aimed at newspaper level; e) a student's dictionary." (J Milton Cowan, "Program in Oriental Languages," *ACLS Newsletter*, X [May 1959], 3.) During the first six years of this Program work was done on 38 languages and important dialects of major languages, 25 books were published, and 18 manuscripts were readied for publication. The languages and dialects included Arabic (modern literary, Egyptian, Iraqi, Moroccan), Armenian (East, West), Azerbaijani, Berber, Burmese, Cambodian, Chinese (literary, Amoy, Mandarin, Shanghai), Georgian, Hindi, Indonesian, Javanese, Kannada, Karen, Kazakh, Khasi, Korean, Kurdish, Lao, Marathi, Mongol, Pashto, Persian, Sindhi, Telegu, Thai, Tibetan, Uigur, Urdu, Uzbek, and Vietnamese. The CLP was also actively engaged in the production of manuals for the teaching of English as a second language; this aspect of its work will be discussed later.

The type of language instruction which we have described as the linguists' goal during the wartime period – graded materials based on a structural analysis of the foreign language, presentation of the structure by a trained linguist, several hours of drill per day with a native speaker in small classes, primary emphasis on a practical speaking knowledge – continued to be given for the less usual languages at a number of universities, and also in a few special programs. Outstanding among these latter was the Language Training Program of the Foreign Service Institute (FSI), United States Department of State, in Washington. This program was established early in 1946 for the purpose of teaching foreign languages to members of the Foreign Service. (Cf. Perry N. Jester and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., "Language training for the Foreign Service and the Department of State," *American Foreign Service Journal*, Sept.–Oct. 1946.) The linguist Henry Lee Smith, Jr., was named Director of Language Studies at the FSI and quickly recruited a highly competent staff of trained linguists. In

the years following 1946 the FSI developed teaching methods and materials to a high degree of excellence. In two respects it even assumed some of the aspects of a university: it served as a training ground for some of the outstanding younger linguists of the country, and in connection with its language teaching it fostered important basic research in linguistics. For example, *An outline of English structure* (Norman, Oklahoma, 1941; – Studies in Linguistics: Occasional Papers, 3), by George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., was written while the authors were at the FSI. In addition, some of the FSI language materials represented pioneering attempts to incorporate stress and intonation systematically into language learning. Though the headquarters of the FSI was in Washington, language training centers were established in foreign countries, and language instruction was provided at many Foreign Service posts. An extensive program was initiated by the linguist John M. Echols in 1950, when an attempt was made to teach German to large numbers of Foreign Service personnel on duty in Germany. (Cf. William G. Moulton, "HICOG learns German," *Information Bulletin*, Monthly magazine of the Office of the U.S. High Commissioner for Germany, October 1950, 27–32.)

Much the same type of language instruction was given at the Army Language School in Monterey, California. Teaching was based on the belief that "language is a set of habits which the student must master and control without conscious reference to the mechanics of grammar"; to obtain the practice needed to form these habits, "students spend 6 hours a day in class for five days a week, in groups of 8 or less, and devote an average of 3 hours to after-class practice." Some idea of the size of the operation can be gained from the fact that, in 1959, over 450 teachers were giving instruction to some 2000 students in 28 different languages. (Val Hempel and Klaus A. Mueller, "Introduction to the US Army Language School," *Modern Language Journal*, XLIII [1959], 62–65. Cf. also Max Oppenheimer, Jr., "The one-year Russian course at the Army Language School," *ibid.*, 66–71; and J. Michael Moore, "The Army Language School: An evaluation," *ibid.*, XLI [1957], 332–337.)

Where the Army established its own school of language training, the Air Force followed a different procedure: that of sending their personnel to civilian institutions. As of 1952, instruction was being given in 19 languages at six colleges and universities, under the direction of trained linguists. (Cf. Charles E. Fulbeck, "The significance of language training in the USAF," *Modern Language Journal*, XXXVI [1952], 341–342.)

Only rarely was this type of instruction being given consistently outside of governmental organizations. Two examples were the Spanish teaching program of the Socony Mobil Oil Co. in Venezuela, under the direction of the linguist C. C. Harris; and the Arabic teaching program of the Arabian American Oil Co., organized by the linguist J Milton Cowan. The trained linguists in this latter program, working in the field and at the company's Sidon Training Center in Lebanon, produced a series of eight textbooks based primarily on the spoken Arabic of eastern Saudi Arabia. (For details of the instructional program, cf. J Milton Cowan, "The Arabic program of the Arabian American Oil Co.," *Report of the Tenth Annual Round Table Meeting on Linguistics and Language Studies* [Washington: Institute of Language and Linguistics, Georgetown University, 1959], pp. 71–74.)

A thoroughgoing attempt to adapt wartime experiences to college language teaching was made at Cornell University, in a program inaugurated in the fall of 1946 with the aid of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Under the direction of J Milton Cowan, a Division of Modern Languages was established, charged with giving elementary and intermediate instruction in all modern foreign languages offered at the university. All of the essential features of wartime instruction were maintained: graded materials based on a structural analysis (the texts were the 'Spoken Language' manuals in Chinese, French, German, Italian, Russian, and Spanish); presentation of the structure by a trained linguist (of the five in charge of the major languages, three had been co-authors of the wartime manuals); daily drill conducted by a native speaker; adequate provision for individual practice (drill classes were limited to ten students each); and initial emphasis on a speaking knowledge. In the matter of number of hours, a compromise obviously had to be made with the wartime practice of fifteen or more hours per week; the solution adopted was a daily drill hour, six days a week, plus two hours a week of language analysis. (Intermediate courses followed the usual college practice of meeting three hours a week.) A further adaptation was the inclusion of extensive instruction in reading, following an initial period of concentration primarily on speaking and understanding. Along with their duties as supervisors of language instruction, the senior staff members continued teaching and research in their various fields of linguistics. As of 1960, the staff included thirteen trained linguists above the rank of instructor, and instruction was being given in fourteen modern foreign languages and in English as a second language. (For details, especially of pedagogy, cf. J Milton Cowan, "The Cornell plan of

language teaching," *Hispania*, XXX [1947], 57–60; and Frederick B. Agard, "The Cornell language program" *Hispania*, XXXII [1949], 27–34. Cf. also the *Modern Language Journal*, XXXIV [1950], 593–603; and *PMLA*, LXVII [Oct. 1952], 38–46.)

When we turn now to other language teaching programs of the post-war period, we leave the areas of activity in which linguists can be said to have played a major role. Even the ASTP language courses, though based on a general plan devised by linguists, were in operation administered primarily by professional language teachers. From the start these teachers were quick to see the implications which this type of instruction might have for civilian courses in schools and colleges. As early as April 1943, the very month in which the ASTP courses began, a conference of linguists and language teachers was held under the sponsorship of the Rockefeller Foundation "to investigate the possibility of incorporating some of the good aspects of the intensified and other new types of experimental language courses into the regular courses given in colleges." (Curtis C. D. Vail, "The Rockefeller language conference," *German Quarterly*, XVII [1944], 120–130.) The MLA *Survey of language classes in the ASTP*, organized in November of 1943 and carried out in February and March of 1944, was also undertaken primarily to find out how these new methods could be applied to school and college work – because, the report states (p. 6), "it was plain that advantage ought to be taken of whatever was novel and useful in the new programs." In the second printing of the *Survey*, seven pages of specific recommendations were added, which discussed ways and means of applying the experiences of the ASTP not only to the college level but also to language teaching in secondary and elementary schools and to teacher training. By this time the journals of the various associations of language teachers were full of articles on the teachers' recent experiences. The November, 1944, issue of the *German Quarterly*, for example, was devoted entirely to the ASTP. Though the teachers had much to criticize and condemn, the general reaction was one of great stimulation and a realization that civilian language courses could never again be quite the same as they had been before the ASTP. Now that the soldier-students were gone (the ASTP was terminated abruptly in April, 1944), enthusiasm ran high for similar types of courses with civilian students. It is significant that, barely a year after its special ASTP number, the *German Quarterly* was able to publish (January 1946) another special issue devoted entirely to "A symposium on intensive German courses for civilians." During these same years (1944–1946) the 'Chicago investigation'

attempted to assess the accomplishments of the new intensive courses, in comparison with those of courses run on more traditional lines. Though the results of the investigation were inconclusive, civilian adaptations of the 'Army method' continued to be made. (Cf. Frederick B. Agard and Harold B. Dunkel, *An investigation of second-language teaching*; and Harold B. Dunkel, *Second-language learning*; both Boston: Ginn & Co., 1948).

In a thoughtful article on 'The Chicago investigation' (*Language Learning*, II [1949], 89–99), Charles C. Fries pointed clearly to a factor which, though largely overlooked during the war years, remained a source of endless misunderstandings between language teachers and linguists. To most language teachers, what was 'new' about the new method was its intensive nature and its primary emphasis on speaking; all talk about instruction being based on 'sound linguistic principles' and being supervised by a 'trained linguist' struck them as professional exaggeration, not to say arrogance, on the part of the linguists. And yet this second aspect of the program was to the linguists the more important of the two. As Fries put it: "For at least ten years some of us have been trying to explain that the fundamental feature of the 'new approach' to language learning is not a greater allotment of time, is not smaller classes, is not even a greater emphasis on oral practice, although many of us believe these to be highly desirable. The fundamental feature of this new approach consists in a scientific descriptive analysis as the basis upon which to build the teaching materials." He then continued, quoting from his book *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945): "It is the practical use of the linguistic scientist's technique of language description, in the choice and sequence of materials, and the principles of method that grew out of these materials, that is at the heart of the so-called 'new approach to language learning'... If an adult is to gain a satisfactory proficiency in a foreign language most quickly and easily he must have satisfactory materials upon which to work – i.e., he must have the really important items of the language selected and arranged in a properly related sequence with special emphasis upon the chief trouble spots... Only with sound materials based upon an adequate descriptive analysis of *both* the language *to be studied* and the native *language of the student* (or with the continued expert guidance of a trained linguist) can an adult make the maximum progress toward the satisfactory mastery of a foreign language." And finally: "In this country, whatever foreign language is taught is directed to those who speak English as their native language, and many of the problems of

this foreign language teaching arise out of the special character of the English language. It is not enough for the foreign language teachers to be able to speak English; to be effective they should know English – its sound system, its structural system, and its vocabulary – from the point of view of a descriptive analysis in accord with modern techniques... One of our important next steps must be to bring linguistic scientists and practical language teachers into closer understanding in order that each may profit from the labors and the experience of the other."

Fries's call for closer understanding between linguists and language teachers brings us to the next great event in language teaching during the past two decades: the Foreign Language Program of the Modern Language Association, inaugurated in the fall of 1952 with the aid of a grant from the Rockefeller Foundation. Under the able and dynamic leadership of the MLA's secretary, William Riley Parker, an effort was made to bring foreign language teachers into closer touch with any and all groups of persons with whom greater cooperation was desirable: professional educators, school administrators, governmental officials, businessmen – and linguists. The October, 1952, supplement of the Association's journal, *PMLA*, brought (on. pp. 4–15) a lucid description of the aims, methods, and applications of linguistic science, written by the linguist Albert H. Marckwardt. The same issue contained the first of a series of descriptions of programs in which the 'new' method had been adapted to foreign language teaching at the college level: William G. Moulton, "The Cornell language program," pp. 38–46. Later articles in this series were descriptions of the programs at Georgetown, by Leon Dostert, LXVIII (April 1953), 3–12; at Princeton, by A. T. MacAllister, LXX (April 1955), 15–22; at Purdue, by Elton Hocking, LXX (Sept. suppl. 1955), 36–45; at Texas, by Ernest F. Haden, LXXI (April 1956), 14–20; and at Maine, by Wilmarth Starr, LXXII (Sept. suppl. 1957), 1–10.

In April, 1954, in *The national interest and foreign languages*, a UNESCO discussion guide and work paper prepared for citizen consultations, William R. Parker presented a lively and stimulating account of the origin and growth of structural linguistics in the United States, and urged that linguists and language teachers cooperate for their mutual benefit: "Commonsense suggests... that if the 260 [active structural linguists in the country] have something valuable to give the 26,000 [active language teachers], as seems more than likely, they will not soon do it by ignoring or antagonizing them, nor will the 26,000 help matters by considering themselves beyond enlightenment." (Cf.

William R. Parker, *The national interest and foreign languages* [U.S. National Commission for UNESCO, Department of State, preliminary edition, April 1954], p. 124; this sprightly remark is omitted in the revised edition of January, 1957.)

On December 4 and 5, 1954, the MLA sponsored a conference of fifteen language teachers and linguists for the purpose of exchanging ideas and outlining areas of agreement and disagreement. One result of this conference was the publication of "A brief bibliography on linguistics for foreign language teachers," by William G. Moulton (*PMLA*, LXX [April 1955], 33–35). A second result was an article on "Language analysis and language teaching," by Archibald A. Hill, written clearly and in non-technical language, full of suggestions on how to apply linguistic principles to language teaching, and including helpful hints on how to recognize a textbook that is (or is not) linguistically sound. This was first published as MLA *FL* [= *Foreign Language*] *Bulletin No. 41* (Dec. 1955, pp. 16, mimeographed); it was later reprinted in the *Modern Language Journal*, XL (Oct. 1956), 335–345.

In September, 1956 (*PMLA*, LXXI [Sept. suppl.], xiii–xxiv), the Steering Committee of the MLA FL Program published nine statements on "FL Program Policy." Since this Steering Committee of eleven members included representatives of all of the professional language teachers associations, its policy statements can be taken as representing the best thinking of the foreign language teaching profession as a whole. The statements recommended, among other things, many of the features of wartime language instruction: initial emphasis on hearing and speaking, followed only later by reading and writing; extensive oral drill in small classes; and provision of enough time to permit the acquisition of a really useful knowledge of the foreign language. It may be noted that these recommendations concern only what Fries had called the "externals of procedure": greater emphasis on oral practice, smaller classes, a greater allotment of time.

During these same years, however, the importance of applying linguistic principles to language teaching – if only the linguists would show clearly how to do so – was becoming more and more widely realized. As early as February 12–13, 1955, in a statement on "Qualifications for secondary school teachers of modern foreign languages" (*PMLA*, LXX [Sept. suppl. 1955], 46–49), the MLA *FL* Steering Committee defined superior ability in language analysis as: "Ability to apply knowledge of descriptive, comparative, and historical linguistics to the language-teaching situation." A little more than a

year later, on May 19–20, 1956, the MLA Foreign Language Program sponsored a "Conference on Criteria for a College Textbook in Beginning Spanish." (Cf. Kenneth W. Mildenberger, "The MLA college language manual project: history and present status," *PMLA*, LXII [Sept. suppl. 1957], 11–18.) Linguistics was strongly represented among the seventeen participants in the conference, and even more strongly in the six-member Working Committee appointed to write the textbook. A number of guiding principles were laid down at the original conference: "The college textbook in elementary Spanish should concentrate at the beginning upon the learner's *hearing* and *speaking* of Spanish. This is the best beginning for students of Spanish, whatever their objective... Grammar should be presented inductively. The inductive generalizations should be linguistically accurate..." To these original specifications the Working Committee later added some of its own, including provision for "Adequate exercise and drill material which is based on a comparison of the structures of the two languages involved, the student's language and the target language... Good drills have several characteristics. First of all, the points to be drilled should be determined by comparing the two languages involved. At points where the structures differ, we can predict classroom difficulty." (J. Donald Bowen, "The Modern Language Association College Language Manual Project," *PMLA*, LXXIV [Sept. suppl. 1959], 20–26.) After several short meetings, much correspondence, and a semester of work together at the University of Texas in the spring of 1958, the committee completed the textbook, and it was published as *Modern Spanish* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1960) – a shining example of fruitful cooperation between language teachers and structural linguists.

An event of even greater potential consequence than the wartime language courses or the MLA Foreign Language Program was the passage by Congress and the signing by the President, on September 2, 1958, of the National Defense Education Act (NDEA), aimed at strengthening instruction throughout the nation in science, mathematics, and modern foreign languages. Although no full assessment can be made as of this writing, activities during the first two years of the act made it abundantly clear that one result will be to bring linguists and language teachers into even closer cooperation. During the summer of 1959, twelve Institutes were conducted for the further training of elementary and high school foreign language teachers, and among other things they received "instruction in linguistic analysis and its application in language teaching." (*Bulletin on the National*

Defense Education Act, August 1, 1959, p. 2. Sections of the NDEA relevant to modern foreign language teaching were reprinted in *PMLA*, LXXII [Dec. 1958], iv–viii. A review of the first year's activities was given in the *Linguistic Reporter*, I. iv [Oct. 1959], 1, 6–7. For "An evaluation of the 1959 summer Language Institutes," prepared by Stephen A. Freeman, see the *Modern Language Journal*, XLIV [1960], 59–63.)

Under provisions of the NDEA, the Language Development Section of the U.S. Office of Education also entered into a number of contracts bringing together linguists and language teachers. It contracted with the MLA for the "preparation and validation of tests for measuring the qualifications of modern foreign language teachers of French, Spanish, German, Italian, and Russian in seven competencies," one of which was applied linguistics; teams of language teachers and linguists constructed the tests during the winter of 1959–1960. With the ACLS a contract was made for the "development of specialized training materials for use in teaching Uralic-Altaic languages, the preparation of a number of basic surveys dealing with the areas and countries where these languages are used, and the conducting of several pertinent research projects," under the direction of the linguist John Lotz. A contract with the Center for Applied Linguistics (see below) provided for the "development of contrastive structure studies of the English language with French, Spanish, Italian, German, and Russian. Such contrastive studies will provide the basis for more effective classroom practices by systematically revealing those aspects of the target language which need particular emphasis through carefully constructed drill. They will constitute a major step in bringing the results of modern linguistic science to bear on the teaching of foreign languages." (For these and other contracts, see *Bulletin on the National Defense Education Act*, July 30, 1959. The MLA contract was also described in *PMLA*, LXXV [March 1960], ix; the ACLS contract in *ACLS Newsletter*, X [Dec. 1959], 3–4; the Center for Applied Linguistics contract in the *Linguistic Reporter*, II. ii [April 1960], 2.) A further contract, made late in 1959, provided for the preparation of a *Manual and anthology of applied linguistics* by a team of five linguists under the editorship of Simon Belasco. This was prepared specifically for use in the applied linguistics courses at the 1960 summer Institutes. (Cf. the *Linguistic Reporter*, II. iii [June 1960], 2.)

The Center for Applied Linguistics mentioned above was another example of the growing cooperation between language teachers and linguists. It was established to meet a number of needs: the tremen-

dously increasing demand for the teaching of English in foreign countries, among other things via the Fulbright Program; the training of Americans in the major languages of Asia, so long neglected in this country; and the improvement of cooperation and communication among linguists, psychologists, and language teachers. The Center was also intended to serve as a clearing house for universities, government agencies, and other institutions or individuals concerned with the application of linguistic science to practical language problems. Aided by a grant from the Ford Foundation, the Center began operations in February, 1959, with the linguist Charles A. Ferguson as Director and the language teacher Raleigh Morgan, Jr., as Associate Director. The MLA agreed to serve as fiscal and administrative agent of the Ford grant and to oversee the work of the Center – an example of cooperation with linguists which would have been inconceivable a decade earlier. During its first year and a half of operation the Center established a journal, the *Linguistic Reporter* (circulation over 3,000); held a conference on English teaching abroad, carried out jointly with the United States Information Agency and in cooperation with the British Council; contracted to produce the Contrastive Structure Studies outlined above; began a survey of second language teaching, in cooperation with British, French, and other organizations; undertook to coordinate and bring up to date existing bibliographies on the teaching of English as a foreign language; cooperated in the preparation of a series of films for teacher training in the applied aspects of linguistics; produced a report on *National Committees Concerned with Language Problems* (March 1960); and compiled a working bibliography on *Contrastive Studies in Linguistics* (March 1960). (On the establishment and activities of the Center, see *PMLA*, LXXIV [March 1959], ix, and the *Linguistic Reporter*, esp. vol. I, no. 1 [April 1959] and vol. II, no. 2 [April 1960]. On the above mentioned conference, see *Proceedings of the Conference on Teaching English Abroad* [Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1960, pp. v, 196].)

The work of the Center for Applied Linguistics brings us to another aspect of the relations between linguistics and language teaching: the teaching of English as a second language. We have chosen to discuss this topic separately because it developed very differently from the teaching of foreign languages. First, until the 1950's it involved only small numbers of students; secondly, from the very start it was largely under the direction of trained linguists. An outstanding example was the English Language Institute of the University of Michigan, founded in 1941 and directed successively by Charles C. Fries, Robert Lado,

and Albert H. Marckwardt. An understanding of the type of instruction given there, and the great extent to which it was based on the techniques of structural linguistics, can perhaps best be indicated by listing some of the publications produced by members of the Institute. Fries had long been a pioneer in the analysis of English on its own terms and as actually spoken and written. He had demonstrated this in his classic article on "The periphrastic future with *shall* and *will* in modern English" (*PMLA*, XL [1925], 963–1024) and in his *American English grammar* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1950, pp. ix, 313). Beginning in 1942 the Institute began publishing *An intensive course in English for Latin-American students*, by Fries and his staff. This appeared in a number of editions, most recently as *An intensive course in English*, by the English Language Institute Staff, Robert Lado, director, Charles C. Fries, consultant (4 vols., Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1954–1958). An early revision and expansion of the volume on pronunciation led to the pioneering work by Kenneth L. Pike, *The intonation of American English* (Ann Arbor; University of Michigan Press, 1946, pp. xi, 200). In the meantime, Fries had published his celebrated *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1945, pp. vii, 153), a work which demonstrated with admirable clarity what Fries meant by the 'new approach' to language teaching. The English course for Latin American students was then followed by Charles C. Fries and Yao Shen, *An intensive course in English for Chinese students* (4 vols., Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1946). (It is worth recording here that this and the following years saw the publication at Michigan of three other important volumes on linguistics which, though not directly part of the work of the Institute, undoubtedly influenced it and were to some extent influenced by it: in 1946 Eugene A. Nida's *Morphology* (2nd and completely new edition 1949), in 1947 Kenneth L. Pike's *Phonemics*, and in 1948 his *Tone languages* [all Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press].)

During the immediately following years Fries continued his investigations of English, basing his work this time not on written materials (as for the *American English grammar*) but on mechanically recorded conversations amounting to something over 250,000 running words. These investigations led to a structurally oriented and radically new analysis of English syntax, published in *The structure of English: An introduction to the construction of English sentences* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1952, pp. ix, 304). Three years later Robert Lado compiled an *Annotated bibliography for teachers of English as a foreign language* (– U.S.

Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, *Bulletin 1955*, No. 3, Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1955, pp. vii, 224). He followed this two years later with *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957, pp. viii, 141), a non-technical book which suggests methods not only for comparing sound systems, grammatical structures, vocabulary systems, and writing systems, but also for comparing different cultures. Still another publication growing out of the Institute was *Language Learning: A journal of applied linguistics* (vols. I ff., 1948 ff.). This modest appearing journal offered a wealth of simply written articles applying the techniques of descriptive linguistics to the problems of teaching English and many other languages. A collection of previous articles appeared in the special publication *Selected articles from Language Learning, Series I, English as a foreign language* (1953, pp. [viii], 211).

Michigan was of course not the only institution at which textbooks and other works on the teaching of English as a second language were written. In 1950, under contract with the State Department, the ACLS Committee on the Language Program began work on a project designed to produce textbooks for the teaching of English to speakers of a wide variety of foreign languages. The first step was the production of what came to be called the 'General Form,' a carefully graded presentation of English phonology, morphology, and syntax, with ample provision for drills and exercises. The phonology in particular, based largely on the analysis in George L. Trager and Henry Lee Smith, Jr., *An outline of English structure* (1951), was a marked innovation. This initial volume was completed by a team of linguists including William E. Welmers and Raven I. McDavid, Jr., and was published as *Structural notes and corpus: A basis for the preparation of materials to teach English as a foreign language* (Washington: Committee on the Language Program, ACLS, 1952, pp. x, 109). Using this 'General Form' as a point of departure, and adapting it as necessary to the language of the learners, further teams of linguists then proceeded to the writing of the actual textbooks. Ten in all were completed: for speakers of Burmese, Mandarin Chinese, Greek, Indonesian, Korean, Persian, Serbo-Croatian, Thai, Turkish, and Vietnamese. They were published by the ACLS during 1953–1956, with the linguist Martin Joos serving as publication editor. A companion volume explaining the use of the textbooks was William E. Welmers, *Spoken English as a foreign language: Instructor's manual* (Washington: ACLS, 1953, pp. iv, 27). A work written along much the same lines but published commer-

cially was Frederick B. Agard et al., *El inglés hablado* (New York: Henry Holt, 1953, pp. xii, 403). (The ten volumes of the ACLS series are listed in the *Linguistic Reporter*, I. iv [Oct. 1959], 5: those still in print in 1960 in *ACLS Newsletter*, XI. iii [March 1960], 33.)

Besides these textbooks, two linguistically oriented general books on the teaching of English as a second language need to be mentioned. Edwin T. Cornelius, Jr., *Language teaching: A guide for teachers of foreign languages* (New York: Thomas Y. Crowell, 1953, pp. 168), applied the principles of structural linguistics to the teaching of English in particular, but also suggested ways in which the same techniques can be used for other languages. Earl W. Stevick, *Helping people learn English: A manual for teachers of English as a second language* (New York and Nashville: Abingdon Press, 1957, pp. 138), offered a wealth of helpful, practical, and linguistically sound suggestions for the American abroad who finds himself suddenly asked to teach English in the country where he is residing. Both books showed the influence of the 'General Form' and of the Trager-Smith analysis of American English phonology.

Michigan was likewise not the only place at which successful programs for the teaching of English as a second language were in operation. The increasing demand for programs of this sort led to their establishment at a number of universities, usually in connection with graduate work in general linguistics. Examples were the program at Georgetown University, Washington, D.C., directed by Leon Dostert; at American University, also in Washington, directed by Hugo J. Mueller; and at the University of Texas, Austin, Texas. (Cf. the *Linguistic Reporter*, I. iii [Aug. 1959], 3–4; II. ii [April 1960], 1, 4; II. iii [June 1960], 3–4).

During the 1950's American linguists also became increasingly active in teaching English, or in supervising programs for the teaching of English, in many foreign countries. Large numbers of them were invited by the Committee on International Exchange of Persons, Conference Board of Associated Research Councils, to teach English abroad under the auspices of the Fulbright Program. Some went as individuals, some as teams; particularly active projects were established for the teaching of English in Italy and Egypt. At other times linguists journeyed abroad at the invitation of a foreign country. Thus during considerable portions of the years 1957–1960 the linguists C. C. Fries, Einar Haugen, Mary Lu Joynes, Patricia O'Connor, and W. F. Twaddell worked in Japan on the teaching of English in that country. (Cf. Patricia O'Connor and W. F. Twaddell, "Intensive training for an

oral approach in language teaching," *Modern Language Journal*, XLIV, No. 2, Part 2, Feb. 1960, pp. vi, 42.) The opposite approach was also used, as when groups of Egyptian teachers of English came to the United States during the late 1950's to work for doctoral degrees in linguistics at Cornell University and the Universities of Michigan and Texas. In still other cases American universities established programs abroad combining linguistics and the teaching of English. Examples were the program in the Philippines of the University of California at Los Angeles; the program in Laos, Thailand, and Vietnam of the University of Michigan; and the program in Turkey of Georgetown University. (Cf. the *Linguistic Reporter*, I. ii [May 1959], 5; I. v. [Dec. 1959], 7–8; II. iii [June 1960], 1, 5.) The great demand abroad for English teaching even led to the establishment of a commercial enterprise to provide the services needed: English Language Services, of Washington, D.C., directed by Edwin T. Cornelius, Jr. The purpose of the organization was to make "professional services available, in order to help fulfill the great need for English teaching, whether by government agencies or non-government organizations; and ELS is prepared to furnish whatever may be required in this endeavor, from the writing of textbooks and the preparation of prerecorded tapes to the staffing and administration of overseas institutes." (The *Linguistic Reporter*, I. iv [Oct. 1959], 3.)

With linguists so active in teaching English as a second language, one might expect that they would be even more occupied in teaching English as a first language, that is, teaching it in American schools and colleges. Such was not, however, the case. As far as the writer knows, no linguist was anywhere engaged in the teaching of English at an elementary or high school. English teaching at this level continued to be given along traditional lines. This meant that it neglected phonology entirely, and that it analyzed English grammar partly in terms of English, partly as if it were Latin, and partly on a prescriptive basis which often did not correspond to actual usage. Such an approach to English obviously does not work well, and perhaps for this reason grammar came to be taught less and less in the schools. Only at the college level were a few linguists engaged in teaching English along linguistic lines, and only here were they producing generally usable materials w ten according to linguistic principles. The following books deser mention: Paul Roberts, *Understanding grammar* (New York: Harpe & Bros., 1954, pp. xvii, 550); the same, *Patterns of English* (New rk: Harcourt, Brace, 1956, pp. v, 314); Donald J. Lloyd and Harr . Warfel, *American English in its cultural setting* (New

York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1956, pp. xv, 553, xviii); Harold Whitehall, *Structural essentials of English* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1956, pp. vi, 154); W. Nelson Francis, *The structure of American English* (New York: Ronald Press, 1958, pp. vii, 614); and James Sledd, *A short introduction to English grammar* (Chicago: Scott, Foresman, 1959, pp. [vi], 346). A more technical book, and one perhaps better used with graduate students than with undergraduates, was Archibald A. Hill, *Introduction to linguistic structures: From sound to sentence in English* (New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1958, pp. xi, 496); this was intended for use not only in English classes but also in courses presenting a general introduction to linguistics. It is significant that by 1958 enough articles and reviews on English had been written to justify the compilation of an anthology: *Readings in applied English linguistics*, ed. by Harold B. Allen (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1958, pp. xiii, 428), containing a total of sixty-five items. Finally, we may mention a slim but stimulating book by Henry Lee Smith, Jr., *Linguistic science and the teaching of English* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1956, pp. 61), originally delivered as the 1954 Inglis Lecture at the Graduate School of Education, Harvard University.

Quite a different application of linguistics to language teaching was made by graduates of the Summer Institute of Linguistics, of which the linguist Kenneth L. Pike was president. During the first 25 years of its existence, from 1934 through 1959, the Institute gave linguistic training to some 4500 persons interested in missionary work; and in 1959 it was administering linguistic work in connection with missionary activities involving some 200 languages and dialects in many parts of the world. The members of the Institute were known to their fellow linguists primarily for the analyses which they made of many hitherto undescribed languages. Along with this work, however, they produced large numbers of books and pamphlets aimed at helping the native populations to become literate. Thus the Institute's *25th anniversary bibliography* (Glendale, Calif., 1960, pp. 52) lists a total of 771 'educational items,' including 448 primers and literacy aids, 150 readers and periodicals, 21 writing aids, and 13 aids to learning Spanish. Still another product of the Institute's work was a simply written but linguistically sophisticated book on language learning: Eugene A. Nida, *Learning a foreign language: A handbook for missionaries* (New York: Committee on Missionary Personnel of the Foreign Missions Conference of North America, 1950, pp. ix, 237).

Still one more application of linguistics to language teaching needs mention. During the late 1940's the linguist Waldo E. Sweet, then a

teacher at the William Penn Charter School in Philadelphia, later professor at the University of Michigan, became interested in applying the findings of structural linguistics to the teaching of Latin. Since the traditional grammar of English is based in large part on Latin, Latin teachers in particular are often quite unaware of the very profound differences in the grammatical structures of the two languages. And yet it is precisely these differences which cause a large amount of the difficulty which English speaking students have in learning Latin. Accordingly, Sweet proposed a new course in Latin based on a contrastive analysis of the grammars of the two languages. The results, along with some very ingenious pedagogical devices, were first published as *Experimental materials* beginning in 1953, and then later as *Latin: A structural approach* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1957, pp. x, 520). (Among a number of stimulating articles written by Sweet the following may be mentioned: "The horizontal approach," *Classical Weekly*, XLIII [1950], 188–121; "Latin without a dictionary," *Classical Outlook*, XXVIII [1950], 28–30; "The key difficulty in first year Latin," *The Independent School Bulletin*, May 1951; and especially "A linguistic approach to the teaching of Latin," *Language Learning*, IV [1951–1952], 42–53.)

To close this review of linguistics and language teaching during the last two decades, we may venture two looks into the future. The outstanding development in linguistic theory in the United States during the late 1950's was undoubtedly the formulation of transformation grammar, notably in Noam Chomsky, *Syntactic structures* (The Hague: Mouton, 1957, pp. 116; cf. also the helpful review by Robert B. Lees, *Language*, XXX [1957], 375–408). How will the language teacher react to this? To overstate the case, transformation grammar is nothing new to the language teacher; he has been using it for years. And yet, as in so many other aspects of language teaching, here also he has been handling intuitively something which linguistic theory can help him to handle rationally and hence more effectively and more extensively. Though transformation grammar is too new to permit predictions, it seems likely that it can have far reaching effects in improving both the presentation of grammatical structure in textbooks and the learning of grammatical structure through classroom drill.

In an article on "Languages in changing education" (*Linguistic Reporter*, I. iii [Aug. 1959], 1, 4–6), the always stimulating Mortimer Graves has stated clearly the vastly increased foreign language needs which face Americans in the second half of the 20th century. "It must be realized that the American who aspires to anything other than

menial participation in the life of the nineteen seventies and eighties will need some sort of control of three or four or half a dozen languages, Asian or African as well as European." As now organized, our educational system offers no solution to this problem whatever. "Foreign language instruction is rigorously separated from instruction in English, and the foreign languages one from the other. Language is commonly presented as chemistry would be if the student first took a course in oxygen, then another in hydrogen, and so on through the hundred or so elements instead of taking a course in chemistry in the first place. And, when the student has... acquired some skill in a single foreign language, he must begin all over again and go through the same classroom operation if and when – as he most certainly will – he comes to need to add other languages to his armament. The process is preposterous." Graves sees the solution to this dilemma in an educational program which will so train the student in his school years that in later life he can learn additional languages "with all the powers that maturity, education, linguistic sophistication, and scientific implements of study can give him. What is advocated is a complete overhauling of the presentation of language, both native and foreign, through our high schools in such a way as to provide a progressive approach to satisfactory use of English and at least one foreign language, together with – even more important – the knowledge, the experience, and the techniques further to expand foreign language skills and to surmount whatever language barriers appear in later life without recourse to the classroom." Is this utopian? It probably is. And yet if linguistics could help the student approach this ideal goal even part way, it would be making its greatest possible contribution to the language learning needs of this country and of the world.

WILLIAM G. MOULTON

Princeton University
Princeton, New Jersey

U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE : 1963 O - 686305